

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America,)	CRIMINAL NO. 3:12cr00089-CMC
)	
v.)	OPINION and ORDER
)	
Gerald Bainard Hardin,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion requesting termination of supervised release. ECF No. 303. The United States Probation Office ("USPO") has recommended that termination of supervision not be granted at this time. The United States Attorney has indicated that he defers to the position of the USPO.

Title 18 United States Code Section 3583(e) provides that

The court may, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)--

(1) terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice

Considerations contained in § 3553 include, *inter alia*, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; the ability to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; the need to protect the public from further crimes of the

defendant; and the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. 18 U.S.C. § 3553.

“The plain language of the statute illustrates that § 3583(e), in the typical case, allows a conduct-based inquiry into the continued necessity for supervision after the individual has served one full year on supervised release.” *United States v. Pregent*, 190 F.3d 279, 282-83 (4th Cir. 1999). However, the statute

is not exclusively limited to considerations of conduct. The language of the statute notes that the district court ‘may’ terminate supervised release ‘if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.’ The phrase ‘the interest of justice’ does give the district court latitude to consider a broad range of factors in addition to an individual’s behavior in considering whether to terminate the supervised release period.

Id. at 283 (citation omitted).

Defendant has been on supervised release for just over one year of his three-year term ordered at sentencing. Defendant has maintained employment while under supervision. However, due to the nature of Defendant’s employment he has moved frequently for several different jobs, reducing his stability in the community. He also had an aggravating role in the offense of conviction, with a two-level increase applied due to “conscious reckless risk of death or bodily injury.” Defendant has a history of violent criminal offenses, and has reported ongoing domestic problems with his common law wife. Therefore, the court **denies** Defendant’s motion to terminate supervised release.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
January 27, 2016